

REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-22 were pending in this application when examined.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer comprising two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths”. As a result, claim 21 has been cancelled. Support for this amendment can be found on page 2, lines 9-18 of the specification.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite “a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer, which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths”. As a result, claim 22 has been cancelled. Support for this amendment can be found on page 2, lines 9-18 of the specification.

Claim 20 has been amended to delete the exemplary packaging medications, and these medications are recited in new claim 23.

I. Foreign Priority

The present application is a national phase application under § 371 of PCT/EP2003/013304, filed November 26, 2003, and claims priority to Austria Patent Application No. 1779/2002, filed November 28, 2002. The USPTO’s PAIR web site indicates that a certified copy of the foreign application has been received by the USPTO. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to acknowledge the claim for foreign priority and acknowledge receipt of the priority application by checking the appropriate boxes in item 12 on the Office Action Summary page of the next Official Action.

II. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for using the term “such as”. Claim 20 has been amended to delete the “such as” language, and the exemplary packaging medications are included in new claim 23. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaule (WO 99/569964; US 6,688,221). As applied to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the features of non-rejected claim 21. Thus, claim 12 recites “A method for the production of a security feature for application onto a packaging film, comprising applying a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer, **which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths**, onto a carrier substrate, and subsequently optionally applying further functional layers”.

The reference does not disclose the application of a **UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer, which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths**, as recited in claim 12.

Therefore, claim 12 is not anticipated by the reference.

Claims 14 and 15 depend directly from claim 12, and thus also are not anticipated by the reference.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Kaule in view of Walter

The Examiner rejects claims 1-8 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaule in view of Walter (US 4,146,418) or alternatively, Walter in view of Kaule. As applied to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the **UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths**. As discussed above, Kaule does not disclose, or suggest, this feature. Walter does not remedy the deficiencies of Kaule. Therefore, claim 1 would not have been obvious over the references.

Claims 2-8 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and thus also would not have been obvious over the references.

Claim 16 recites “A method for the application of regional security features onto a packaging film, wherein a cut-to-size security feature is introduced into a laminating gap of a

laminating unit via web guiding elements ahead of an infeed, and is bonded with the packaging film”.

Kaule does not disclose or suggest “a cut-to-size security feature is introduced into a laminating gap of a laminating unit via web guiding elements ahead of an infeed”, as recited in claim 16.

Kaule teaches “If the ID card consists of a plurality of layers, one of the layers can be provided e.g. with an esthetically appealing cover layer, such as an aluminum or gold layer, **having gaps** which constitute information and/or are dimensioned so as to reveal information or patterns therebelow” (see col. 4, lines 62-67 of US 6,688,221) (emphasis added). However, the reference does not teach or suggest specific types of gaps, and does not teach or suggest introducing the cut-to-size security feature “into a laminating gap of a laminating unit”, as recited in claim 16.

Walter also does not teach or suggest “a cut-to-size security feature is introduced into a laminating gap of a laminating unit” via web guiding elements ahead of an infeed.

Therefore, claim 16 would not have been obvious over the references.

Claims 17-19 depend directly from claim 16, and thus also would not have been obvious over the references.

B. Kaule, Walter and Bitner et al.

The Examiner rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaule in view of Walter or alternatively, Walter in view of Kaule, with evidence from Bitner et al. (US 5,310,060). As applied to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, Kaule and Walter do not disclose or suggest the packaging film of claim 1, because the references do not teach or suggest “a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer, which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths”, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 10 depends directly from claim 1, and thus also would not have been obvious over Kaule and Walter.

The Examiner applies Bitner et al. for allegedly teaching that cold-, thermo- and pressure-forming are all equivalent conventional methods for forming blister and strip packaging. However, Bitner et al. do not disclose or suggest “a UV-curable deep-drawable

separation lacquer, which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths”.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 10 would not have been obvious over Kaule, Walter and Bitner et al.

C. Kaule, Walter and Zeiter et al.

The Examiner rejects claims 9, 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaule in view of Walter or alternatively, Walter in view of Kaule, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Zeiter et al. (US 6,494,491). As applied to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The arguments above regarding Kaule and Walter are also applicable to this rejection. The Examiner cites Zeiter al. for allegedly disclosing packaging films may be formed into packages by deep-drawing. However, the reference does not disclose or suggest “a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer, which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths”, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Kaule, Walter and Zeiter et al.

Claims 9, 11 and 20 depend directly from claim 1, and thus also would not have been obvious over the references.

D. Kaule and Reinhart

The Examiner rejects claims 13 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaule in view of Reinhart (EP 0210620). As applied to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, Kaule does not disclose or suggest “A method for the production of a security feature for application onto a packaging film, comprising applying **a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer, which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths**, onto a carrier substrate, and subsequently optionally applying further functional layers”.

The Examiner asserts that Reinhart discloses a lacquer that contains two photoinitiators activatable at different wavelengths. However, the reference does not disclose **a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer, which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths**.

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “the present limitations are drawn towards the capability of the UV-curable lacquer to be deep-drawable, not that the lacquer actually is deep-drawn” (lines 18-20). However, amended claim 12 recites a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer, which comprises two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths. The photoinitiators in the method of claim 1 are not merely susceptible to activation at different wavelengths, but do, in fact, activate at different wavelengths, and therefore produce “a UV-curable **deep-drawable** separation lacquer”.

Therefore, the method of claim 12 would not have been obvious over Kaule in view of Reinhart.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12, thus also would not have been obvious over the references.

E. Kaule, Walter and Reinhart

The Examiner rejects claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaule in view of Walter or alternatively, Walter in view of Kaule, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Reinhart. As applied to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The features of claim 21 have been incorporated into claim 1.

As discussed above, Kaule and Walter do not disclose or suggest “A packaging film with regionally applied security features, wherein the packaging film has in defined areas one or several security features applied thereon, the application of the security features taking place with the detachment of the security feature from a carrier substrate **provided with a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer comprising two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths.**”

The Examiner asserts that Reinhart discloses a lacquer that contains two photoinitiators activatable at different wavelengths. However, the reference does not disclose **a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer** comprising two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different wavelengths.

As discussed above, the Examiner states that “the present limitations are drawn towards the capability of the UV-curable lacquer to be deep-drawable, not that the lacquer actually is deep-drawn” (lines 18-20). However, amended claim 1 recites a UV-curable deep-drawable separation lacquer comprising two or more different photoinitiators that are activated at different

wavelengths. The photoinitiators are not merely susceptible to activation at different wavelengths, but do, in fact, activate at different wavelengths, and therefore produce “a UV-curable **deep-drawable** separation lacquer”.

Therefore, claim 1 would not have been obvious over the references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

For these reasons, Applicants take the position that the presently claimed invention is clearly patentable over the applied references.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the rejections set forth by the Examiner have been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Friedrich KASTNER et al.

By Andrew B. Freistein/
Digitally signed by /Andrew B. Freistein/
DN: cn=/Andrew B. Freistein/, o=WLP,
ou=WLP, email=afreistein@wendroth,
c=US
Date: 2010.06.14 14:02:06 -0400

Andrew B. Freistein
Registration No. 52,917
Attorney for Applicants

ABF/emj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 14, 2010